1593

Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER — PROUDHON

Vol. IX.—No. 19. NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1893. Whole No. 253.

"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;
And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."

JOHN HAY.

Problems of Anarchism.

INTRODUCTION.

1.—*Society and Individual Liberty.*

Life throughout all its manifestations has one common need, unimpeded growth, which in man becomes translated into the aspiration for individual freedom. Being a necessary condition to progressive development, it is remarkable that so primary a want arising out of life itself should still be so imperfectly understood and so dimly recognized.

The desire for liberty has accompanied the human race as well as other animal species under nearly all conditions known to us. Sometimes crushed and well-nigh stamped out, it has in the long run always reasserted itself, for indeed it is inseparable from conscious existence. The struggle of man against nature early became the struggle of man against man. This form of the battle is not ended yet. And the ever present need of personal freedom has borne and still bears a prominent part in the contest.

In the purely animal horde from which our human ancestors at some time slowly grew into societies having more or less cohesion there was doubtless a larger measure of individual liberty than was afterwards possible. But the term is meaningless except in its relative application to man as a social being living in some kind of definite relation to his fellows. So that, when we speak of personal liberty and the desire for unhindered development, it is always in relation to society, and only in the social state that the individual man is the subject of study and investigation.

Society, however, has never ceased to put a halter on the freedom of its members. Not content with limiting each so as to allow all an equal share of liberty, or rather giving freedom to all bounded only by consideration of others, it has from the first inclined to destroy entirely the liberty of the individual; by custom, by law, by religion, by enforced economic conditions, by the whole routine of life it has checked his progress, stolen away his rights, fettered his natural power of development, and almost annihilated his freedom.

True progress and civilization are nothing but the gradual acquirement of liberty by each. Every progressive change, every reform, every improvement is a revolution in favor of the individual. Let us for a moment take a perspective view of the past. We can then better realize the position attained in the present.

The earliest social condition we yet know of seems to have been largely communistic in form. The tribe or clan is the unit. The man is quite subordinate. No rights, no property, for him exists: these are thought of only as connected with the unit of which he is a part.

Seldom has he a wife of his own; children are not his, they belong either to the tribe or to maternal relatives. Custom rules all his actions. His conduct the crudest savagery; his passions, tempered by the instinct of self-preservation, his only guide. All, however, set in the mold of the social state in which he lives. Society claims him and holds him for its own. Individuality does not thrive here. There is but little aspiration for freedom or a better condition. Progress is painfully slow. The dark night of this age must have been terribly protracted.

The next stage of social growth discloses the family as the unit of society, not of course the family as it now obtains, but each member still dependent on the collectivity; chieftainship or monarchy having developed as the political form. Religion now takes a more permanent hold; whatever the individual may have gained through the evolution of the community, he loses by subordinating himself to the prevailing superstition. All the abuses that enslave man now hold revel, and liberty for him seems farther off than ever.

From this form of society various developments finally break forth. The individual at length emerges as the social unit. His rights, his property, his liberty begin to have theoretical recognition. Thus far reached the society of ancient Rome. But the domination of class, of riches and privilege, the power of political despotism, the sinister influence of religious superstition, combined still closer to enslave the individual. It would be too much to assert that we have left this stage entirely behind us even now. But it is safe to say that the first break was made in that dark epoch when the New World was discovered four centuries ago. Most assuredly this turned out to be the mightiest stroke, of all that followed in periodic succession, for the cause of human freedom, of personal liberty. A general revolt against the time-worn tyranny of a huge superstition, claiming universal authority over all men, soon followed. It was the spontaneous outburst of individuals in divers places awakening at last to the need for free growth for liberty, realizing, and wanting to break, the chains that for so long had bound them in moral and intellectual slavery. The shackles were not thrown off so easily. Again and again have they been forged afresh, but are snapped asunder as the ever-growing desire for freedom impels the individual to leave his ancient beliefs behind. Today we see them eternally shattered. Knowledge, truth, science, slowly but surely undermine all that is left, and leave supernaturalism the naked and unmistakable force of reaction and conservative decay, like a great mountain seen through a mist from which man is steadily receding as he goes forward in pursuit of his freedom.

Following closely upon the moral and religious revolt came the movement for political reform. Revolutions have destroyed the prerogatives of kings, taken the power from aristocracy, and we now see democracy wholly or in part wielding the privileges once the exclusive right of a few. Individual liberty has been sought through the form of political equality. Whether achieved or not, it has been the aim of all the great changes in the form and powers of government since the American and French revolutions. With this primary aim the young republic of the western world set out on her career. And ever since have the progressive nations of Europe been following in her footsteps. Liberty for all means freedom for each; unhindered individual development has thus been the motto and the essence of the great progressive movements of modern civilization.

WM. BAILIE.

Religion and Government.

[Translated from Nietzsche's "Menschliches, Allzumenschliches," by George Schumm.]

As long as the State, or rather the government, regards itself as the guardian of the minor masses, and in their behalf considers the question whether religion shall be maintained or abolished, it will most probably always decide in favor of the maintenance of religion. For religion satisfies the individual nature in times of loss, privation, terror, distrust,—that is, when the government is incapable of doing anything directly for the relief of the mental sufferings of the private man; aye, even during times of general, inevitable, and at first insurmountable evils (starvation, financial crises, wars) religion is productive of a composed, expectant, trustful attitude of the masses. When the necessary or accidental shortcomings of government, or the dangerous results of dynastic interests, become apparent to the intelligent, and fill them with the sentiment of hostility, the unintelligent will fancy they see the fingers of God, and patiently submit to the commands from *above* (in which conception divine and human government usually blend), thus preserving internal peace and the continuity of development. The force which lies in the unity of popular feeling, in the same general opinions and aims of the people, is under the protection and sanction of religion, except in those rare cases when the priesthood cannot come to an agreement with the political power concerning the price, and bids it defiance. The State generally knows how to win to its side the priesthood, because it is in need of its most private, subtle control of souls, and can appreciate servants who apparently and externally represent an entirely different interest. Without the assistance of the priests no power can become "legitimate" even now, as Napoleon understood.

Thus absolute paternalism in government and the careful maintenance of religion necessarily go hand in hand. Now it is to be assumed that the governing persons and classes come to an understanding of the benefit which religion offers them, and that, inasmuch as they employ it as a means, they will feel themselves superior to it: wherefore freethought takes its rise here.

But what if that entirely different conception of government begins to prevail which is taught in *democratic* States? What if we see nothing in it except the instrument of the popular will, no high in contrast to low, but exclusively a function of the sole sovereign, the people? The same position only which the people assume toward religion can here be assumed also by the government; the spread of enlightenment will necessarily extend to its representatives; the utilization and exploitation of the religious forces and consolations in behalf of political purposes will not be easily possible (except that powerful political leaders temporarily exert an influence which resembles that of enlightened despotism). But when the State may no longer derive any benefit from religion itself, or when the people are much too divided in their opinions concerning religious matters to admit of a homogeneous, unitary course on the part of the government respecting religious measures, the inevitable result will be to treat religion as a private affair and to relegate it to the conscience and custom of the individual. It will at first appear as if the religious feeling had become intensified, inasmuch as some of its hidden and suppressed tendencies which the State involuntarily or deliberately refused to countenance now break forth and swing to the opposite extreme; later it will be seen that religion is overgrown with sects, and that a plenitude of dragon's teeth were sown the moment religion was made a matter of private concern. The sight of contention, the hostile exposure of all the weak spots of religious confessions, will finally admit of no other alternative than that all the better and more gifted minds espouse irreligion as their private opinion: which sentiment now also gains ascendancy among the governing persons and, almost against their will, gives to their measures the character of hostility to religion. When this happens, the feeling of all fundamentally religious persons who formerly adored the State as something semi or wholly sacred will change into a feeling of decided *hostility to the State;* they will be on the alert for the measures of the

(Continued on page 3.)

Liberty.

Issued Weekly at Two Dollars a Year; Single Copies, Four Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Office of Publication, 120 Liberty Street.
Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 1312, New York, N. Y.

Entered at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., JANUARY 7, 1893.

"*In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the excise man, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel.*"—PROUDHON.

☞ The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

SUBSCRIPTION LIST.

We, the undersigned, hereby agree, in case Benj. R. Tucker shall decide to publish in book form a compilation of articles written by him for his paper, Liberty, to purchase of him, at the rate of one dollar each, the number of copies herewith set opposite our respective names, and to pay to Benj. R. Tucker one-half the amount due for these copies whenever he shall call for it, and the balance on the appearance of the book.

PREVIOUSLY ACKNOWLEDGED, ...	573 copies.
James D. Metcalfe, Elgin, Ill., ...	2 "
W. L. Willis, 1946 Boonville St., Springfield, Mo., . .	1 "

An Important Work.

The series of articles from the pen of William Bailie, begun in this number under the general title of "Problems of Anarchism," will probably continue for many months and will deal with most of the sociological questions with which the Anarchistic movement is concerned. I have seen but a small part of the manuscript as yet, but, knowing Comrade Bailie as I do and the excellent articles that he has previously written for Liberty, I feel justified in beginning its publication, regardless of any deviations from Liberty's chosen path that future chapters may show. I do not expect that his views will differ materially from Liberty's, but in any case Comrade Bailie's earnestness and ability furnish a perfect guarantee that the differences which may develop will be worth considering.

Perhaps Liberty's readers would like to know something of this new contributor. He is a young Irish workingman, who for some years past has lived in Manchester, England. There he was a Communist of the Kropotkine school, one of the most ardent workers for that cause in England, and a frequent writer for the "Commonweal." Coming to this country a year and a half ago, he made Boston his home and became intimately acquainted with Liberty, of whose teachings he, like most Communists, had a very hazy conception. The closer contact with Anarchistic thought soon inspired him with great interest in it, and he frequently sought interviews with me and with other comrades for the discussion of knotty points. The result is that he has thrown his Communism overboard and is today as good an Anarchist as one would care to see.

Regarding the series of articles now begun, he writes me as follows:

Strictly speaking, Anarchism is a political rather than an economic doctrine, but it is found in practice to involve the economic aspect of society even as fundamentally as it does the political. I have long felt that Anarchist literature—at least such of it as I am acquainted with—is lacking in a connected and scientific presentation of its economic conceptions. A correlation of the main results, accepted by competent Anarchists, of what is and is not economic truth, including the special characteristics of Anarchist economics, seems to me to be a work worthy of being accomplished.

That the articles I am engaged upon will perform this function I certainly do not claim. Too well do I know my unfitness and want of preparation for such a task. Moreover, I should not care to assert that there exists the needful harmony among the believers in our doctrine in the field of economics to render such a standard work possible. One thing, however, I make bold to undertake. Anarchists of some schools and nearly all other Socialists present the most hopeless confusion in their economic ideas. To dissipate some of these fallacies and endeavor to establish some principles that are sound would prove not without value. This attempt I have the temerity to make. If the effort should succeed even partially, Socialist economics will decidedly gain, and the ground would be cleared somewhat for the above-mentioned task.

The preliminary part of the series is a brief and necessarily rough outline of the political attitude of Anarchy. Forming an introduction to the economic inquiry, it is doubtless likely to prove trite enough in subject matter to the readers of Liberty. I could not avoid this risk while making the scope of my subject clear.

I hope that this too modest announcement of Mr. Bailie's purpose will insure attentive consideration of what he has to offer. T.

Is It a Vote?

We certainly could not complain (supposing we had the inclination) of any scantness of attention to Anarchism in current magazine discussion,—I mean on the principle that it is better to be abused than ignored. Anarchism is not ignored; almost everybody who deals with reform feels the propriety of referring in some way or other to the ideas and practices of Anarchism. The fact that the ideas and practices generally cited as Anarchistic are the illegitimate and unhealthy offspring of complacent ignorance does not affect the statement I wish to make,—that a good deal of attention is being paid to what is mistaken for Anarchism by the writers in the leading magazines. It is gratifying to have to note a circumstance which argues so well for the conscience, if not for the understanding, of the enlightened teachers who appear in the literary arena (presumably) to disseminate knowledge and truth. It is not our fault that the same fact which is so favorable to the contributors happens to put the editors in a rather unfavorable light. The writers who fall into amusing and other blunders in their well-meant criticisms of Anarchism may plead misinformation as an extenuating circumstance; but what plea is there left for the editors who are informed of the true state of the case and who allow ignorance to go unexposed and injustice unrebuked; who, by refusing a hearing to the misrepresented, deliberately assume responsibility for the circulation of error and baseless charges? Of course the average editor would think it highly diverting to hear that his conduct stands in need of apology; his magazine being published in the interest of his pocket rather than that of sweetness and light, it must be apparent to every one that to burden his pages with commercially valueless matter would be the height of unreason. But there are other editors, who profess to apply another test than popularity and to be governed by considerations of fairness to some extent; how will they explain their apparent determination to screen their readers from an introduction to the ideas of real Anarchists?

In at least two December magazines are we treated to grave criticisms of what the writers imagine to be the Anarchistic position. In the "Arena" Mr. Thomas B. Preston, in attempting to answer the question, "Are We Socialists?" finds it necessary to define or characterize the various reformatory schools of the day; and this is how he discharges his duty with reference to Anarchism:

> It would abolish all government, and leave individuals subject only to natural laws. In a perfect state of society, the Anarchists claim, men would do right without any laws. Education and self-control would rule the individual, and any other kind of regulation would be an unwarranted interference with personal freedom. Communities would be formed of individuals attracted to each other by a similarity of tastes and desires. If a member of one of these groups became dissatisfied, he would leave it, and join some other group more congenial to his tastes. Truth, justice, and honor would be followed for their own sake, and not through fear of any repressive laws. . . . Theoretical Anarchy may thus be defined as a state of society in which every one does as he pleases without doing wrong. Indeed, such perfect Anarchy is only possible in heaven. As long as men are subject to the physical necessities of the body, it is morally certain that there will be a clash of material interests which requires regulation; and such regulation requires government. The trouble with many Anarchists, however, is that they wish to bring about their system by violence if necessary, and consider the first step toward its attainment to be the forcible destruction of present systems of government. In theory they simply carry out to an exaggerated absurdity the doctrine of non-interference with personal liberty,—that "the best government is that which governs least."

Were I addressing the readers of the "Arena," I should take up Mr. Preston's assertions one by one and proceed to prove that not one of them applies to genuine Anarchism. Of course it would be easy to show that Mr. Preston has "Communistic Anarchism" in mind, and that, the logical and philosophical Anarchism of the individualists not being taken cognizance of, the points made against something radically opposed to it could not affect it in the least. It would be easy to convince Mr. Preston and his readers that the talk about "perfect society," "groups," or "similarity of tastes," is totally irrelevant to a discussion of true Anarchism. But I am not now addressing Mr. Preston or his readers, and therefore do not need to go into those questions. My thoughts are now busy with the editor of the "Arena," Mr. Flower, who, I have ample reason to believe, knows full well that his contributor is unintentionally misleading and therefore unfair to his readers as well as to the real Anarchists who will be condemned unheard and through a comedy of errors and misunderstandings. Mr. Flower understands the Anarchistic position, and he realizes that the Communistic usurpers of the name Anarchists neither profess nor follow the cardinal principles of scientific Anarchism; yet he permits an indiscriminate and erroneous indictment of Anarchism to appear in his magazine, regardless of the inevitable injustice of any verdict based upon it. I am not irrational enough to expect Mr. Flower to append critical comment and correction to articles dealing with general problems or move-

ments; but I do expect him to welcome such comment and correction from those who are entitled to make it and to give Anarchists the floor for the purpose of presenting their side of the question.

I regret to say that I do *not* as confidently expect such hospitality from the editor of the "Popular Science Monthly," against whom we have a case that is even stronger than that I have made out against Mr. Flower. He prints in the December number of his magazine an address by Arthur Kitson on the "Fallacies of Modern Economists," in which the single-tax, State Socialism, and Philosophical Anarchism are referred to. The address is brimful of inconsistencies and superficialities. But I leave everything that does not directly concern Anarchism on one side, and quote the following:

> The Anarchists, observing that many laws work injustice and wrong to thousands, and that great advantages have been brought about by the repeal of them, reason that the summit of human happiness will be attained by the repeal of *all* laws and the abolition of *all* government, strangely forgetting that mankind have found both government and law essential to the organization and stability of society, forgetting also that well-merited punishment is very generally meted out to criminals by law. It does not follow that, because within certain limits the benefits of a given system are found to vary in a direct ratio with its extent of application, the same ratio will be continued *ad infinitum*. "Trees do not grow up to the skies." The man who gradually reduced his donkey's daily rations in hopes of eventually accustoming him to do without food succeeded in accomplishing his purpose. But the donkey died. May I ask my Anarchist friends if they have contemplated under their scheme the possibility of the death of their donkey,—society?
>
> Philosophical Anarchism and the doctrine of non-invasion must fall short of its purpose unless all men confine themselves to their own business and do not interfere with their neighbors. But the presence of a handful of men in an Anarchistic community who determined to live by plunder would suffice to destroy either Anarchism or the community. Anarchy reminds one of a certain Chinese puzzle, the solution of which depended upon getting a number of different-shaped blocks together and dropping them at the same instant, so that they fell exactly into their respective places. If one happened to fall slightly out of place, it upset the entire number. Philosophical Anarchy can only exist when all men have attained that condition where each fits his place and is content to remain in it.

The only thing to be said in comment is that Mr. Kitson has not the remotest notion of what philosophical Anarchism is. There is absolutely no more reason why one or a few invaders should overthrow a whole Anarchist society than why the criminals of today should make social life utterly impossible for all of us. We have tacitly agreed to avoid such low species of competition as murder and robbery in the legal sense, and we manage to carry on existence without these. When some of us violate that tacit agreement, they are more or less effectually quashed,—and life goes on as before. Criminals do not create any panic; we pursue the even tenor of our way, taking due precautions against unpleasant surprises. Why, then, would not an Anarchist society be equal to the task of protecting itself against aggressors? Mr. Kitson manifestly talks without any knowledge of his subject; he does not understand that Anarchists simply mean that men should, tacitly or otherwise, agree to deprive themselves of the pleasure of certain other encroachments and interferences with liberty in addition to those already ruled out. He evidently thinks that the "abolition of *all* government and the repeal of all laws" is equivalent, in intention and fact, to the deliberate abandonment of all attempts to restrain and punish crime. Imagining that Anarchists predicate "absolute liberty" and non-resistance (or at least no regular and systematic resistance) to crime, Mr. Kitson seeks to impress them with the fatuity of the proposal by the old but ever instructive tale of the donkey. He virtually makes the point that absolute liberty is something unthinkable under social conditions and is invariably reduced to license for some and slavery for others. Had he taken the trouble to inform himself of the definitions given by Anarchists of "law" and "government," he would have learned that Anarchists make due provision for the health and comfort of the donkey,—that they do not propose to encourage crime and violence and do not intend to endanger the stability of society. The Anarchists are convinced that the law of equal freedom, if obeyed, assures the donkey life and health, and they will abolish nothing that can show a valid title to existence under the seal of equal freedom. Everything and everybody not in rebellion against equal liberty will be fully protected and guarded. No doubt there would be attempts to disregard the social compact in an Anarchistic society, as there are attempts to violate present "agreements"; but the difficulties of disposing of criminals would not (to say the least) be greater than they are today.

Ignorance, however, does not excuse any one in the republic or Anarchy of letters. The fact that Mr. Kitson made unintelligent remarks on Anarchism in the "Popular Science Monthly" makes it only fair on the editor's part that he should allow an Anarchist to correct his contributor and counteract the mischief done by him. Mr. Kitson named the victims of his contempt, and, if injustice has been done them, they should be afforded an opportunity for self-defence. True, society has not yet tacitly agreed to be scrupulously fair in such matters; unfairness of this kind and degree does not involve serious consequences to the contributor or editor. But Mr. Youmans and his contributors pose as leaders and teachers of a higher ethical code; they profess to desire the application of a higher standard to conduct; and surely no great sacrifice is demanded of them when we ask the privilege of addressing their constituency. I move that the Anarchists be given the floor. Is the motion seconded? Is it a vote? V. Y.

The responses to my call for payment of the first instalment due from subscribers to the book-fund have come in very satisfactorily. Nevertheless a considerable number have not yet paid, perhaps because the issue of December 10, in which I called for the money, received abominable treatment from the post-office, and may consequently have failed to reach many subscribers. I wish that all who have not already responded would send me at once one-half the amount of their subscription (or the whole, if they prefer to finish the matter with one remittance). I hope to issue the book by February 15, if subscribers are prompt in their payments.

The wisdom of Nietzsche's remark in this week's instalment of Mr. Schumm's interesting translations from that author, deprecating work for the destruction of the State, depends upon its meaning. If Nietzsche simply deprecates attempts to destroy the State by force, of course he is right; but, if he intends to condemn those who are trying to destroy the State by convincing the people that it is an evil, then his position is incomprehensible, for he, more than any other German of the present generation, by holding the State up to derision and showing its tyrannical nature, has contributed to its destruction.

Religion and Government.

(Continued from page 1.)

government, they will seek to hinder, to cross, to give the greatest possible annoyance, and thereby drive the opposite party, the irreligious, through the heat of their opposition, into an almost fanatical enthusiasm *for* the State; wherein the additional factor comes into play that in these circles people feel a void since their separation from religion and are provisionally looking for a compensation, for a sort of filling-up in their devotion to the State. After these perhaps protracted transition struggles, it will finally be decided whether the religious parties are still powerful enough to restore an ancient condition and turn back the wheel of progress,—in which case enlightened despotism (perhaps less enlightened and timid than formerly) will inevitably take possession of the State,—or whether the irreligious parties will assert themselves and for several generations, perhaps by means of the school and education, undermine and finally make impossible the perpetuation of their opponents. Then also their enthusiasm for the State will begin to wane; it will become more and more evident that with the religious adoration for which the State is a mystery, a supernatural institution, also the reverent and affectionate attitude towards it has been shaken. Henceforth the individuals will view it only in the light in which it may become helpful or harmful to them, and strive by all means to gain influence over it. But this competition will soon become too great, people and parties will change too rapidly, and mutually hurl themselves too wildly again from the eminence after they have scarcely reached it. All measures passed by government will lack the guarantee of permanence; people will be frightened from enterprises which require a quiet growth of decades and centuries in order to bear ripe fruit. Nobody will any longer feel any other obligation to a law than temporarily to submit to the force which it represents: but at once the effort will be made to undermine it by a new force, by a newly-to-be-formed majority. Finally—we may say it with confidence—the distrust of all government, the conviction of the uselessness and worry of these asthmatic struggles, must force people to an entirely new resolve,—to the abolition of the State, to the cancellation of the antithesis "private and public." Step by step private associations will absorb governmental functions; even the most tenacious survival of the old work of government (the protection, for instance, of the private man against the private man) will one day be assumed by private enterprise. The neglect, the decay, and the *death of the State*, the untrammelling of the private person (I am careful not to say: the individual), is the outcome of the democratic conception of the State; here lies its mission. Has it accomplished its task,—which like all things human is fraught with much reason and unreason,—have all relapses into the old distemper been overcome, a new leaf will be turned in the fablebook of mankind, on which one may read all sorts of strange histories and perhaps also some good things.

To briefly repeat what has just been said: the interests of paternal government and the interests of religion go hand in hand, so that, when the latter begins to decay, the foundation of the State will also fall to pieces. The belief in a divine order of political matters, in a mystery in the life of the State, is of a religious origin: if religion disappears, the State will inevitably lose its old Isis veil and no longer command reverence. The sovereignty of the people, seen closely, serves to frighten away the last spell and superstition in the domain of these sentiments; modern democracy is the historical form of the *decay of the State*.

The prospect resulting from this certain decay is, however, not in every regard an unfortunate one: human prudence and selfishness are of all qualities the most highly developed; when the State shall no longer meet the requirements of these forces, it will be least of

all a state of chaos that will arise, but a still more expedient invention than the State will supersede the State. How many an organizing power has mankind already seen decay,—for instance, that of tribal promiscuity, which for thousands of years was more powerful than the family, yes, which ruled and held sway long before the latter arose. We ourselves see how the important creation of law and power, the family, which once dominated wherever Roman influence prevailed, is becoming more and more pale and impotent. So a later generation will also see the State become meaningless in certain regions of the earth,—an idea which many people of the present time can hardly entertain without fear and abhorrence. To *work* for the spread and realization of this idea is of course a different matter: one must think very presumptuously of his own reason, and have studied history hardly to any purpose, if he would put hands to the plow at this early day,—while as yet no one can point to the seed which shall be scattered over the furrowed earth. Let us trust, therefore, to "the prudence and selfishness of men" that *for awhile yet* the State will continue to exist, and that the destructive attempts of overzealous and too hasty sciolists will be rejected!

Socialism in Regard to Its Means.—Socialism is the fantastical younger brother of the almost defunct despotism which it aims to succeed; its aspirations are therefore in the deepest sense reactionary. For it strives after a degree of political power such as no despotism has ever wielded: yes, it exceeds anything in the past by aiming at the complete extinction of the individual, who appears as an unwarranted luxury of nature, and who is to be transformed by it into a useful *organ of the commonwealth*. By virtue of its kinship it always appears in proximity to all display of power, like the old typical Socialist Plato at the court of the Sicilian tyrant; it wishes (and under circumstances fosters) the Cæsarian State of this century, because, as was remarked, it aims to become its successor. But even this inheritance would not suffice for its purposes; it needs the most abject submission of all citizens to the absolute State, the like of which has never existed; and as it can no longer rely on the old religious piety for the State, but must rather involuntarily work for the removal of the same,—because it works for the removal of all existing *States*,—it can indulge in the hope of dominion here and there for brief periods only, through the most extreme terrorism. Therefore it is secretly preparing itself for reigns of terror, and drives the word "justice" like a nail into the head of the half-educated masses, in order to rob them completely of their reason (after this reason has already greatly suffered from the half-education), and to create for them a good conscience for the evil game they are to play. Socialism may serve to teach, in a very brutal and impressive manner, the danger that is in all accumulations of political power, and in so far inspire a distrust of the State itself. If its hoarse voice sounds the battle-cry, "*As much State as possible*," this will at first thereby become more noisy than ever; but soon also the opposite cry will break forth with so much the greater force: "*As little State as possible.*"

LIBERTY'S AGENTS.

New York.—Justus H. Schwab, 50 First Street.
Boston.—A. H. Simpson, 202 Huntington Ave.
Philadelphia.—Henry Heyne, Corner of Tenth and Market Streets.
Detroit.—Herman Reif, 94 Gratiot Ave.
Chicago.—Geo. A. Schilling, 85 Washington Street.
Denver.—Charles Greenhalgh, 1646 Arapahoe St., Room 27.
Columbus, O.—Mrs. H. M. Lyndall, 401 E. Mound St.
Canton, O.—Standard News Co.
London, England.—A. Tarn, 124 Temple Chambers; C. Attersoll, 44 Ellington Street, Barnsbury.
Melbourne, Australia.—D. A. Andrade, 213 Russell Street.

Money and Currency.

BY

A. H. STEPHENSON and G. F. STEPHENS.

The invention of money—The standard of value—Government issues of money—The best currency—Solution of the money question.

Price, 15 cents. Address

JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO.,
1341 Arch St., Phila., Pa.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

ANARCHISM: ITS AIMS AND METHods. An address delivered at the first public meeting of the Boston Anarchists' Club, and adopted by that organization as its authorized exposition of its principles. With an appendix giving the Constitution of the Anarchists' Club and explanatory notes regarding it. By Victor Yarros. 30 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 25 copies, $1.00; 100 copies, $3.00.

LOVE, MARRIAGE, AND DIVORCE, and the Sovereignty of the Individual. A discussion between Henry James, Horace Greeley, and Stephen Pearl Andrews. Including the final replies of Mr. Andrews, rejected by the New York *Tribune*, and a subsequent discussion, occurring twenty years later, between Mr. James and Mr. Andrews. 121 pages. Price, 35 cents.

GOD AND THE STATE. "One of the most eloquent pleas for liberty ever written. Paine's 'Age of Reason' and 'Rights of Man' consolidated and improved. It stirs the pulse like a trumpet call." By Michael Bakounine, Founder of Nihilism and Apostle of Anarchy. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. 52 pages. Price, 15 cents.

CO-OPERATIVE HOMES. An essay showing how the kitchen may be abolished and the independence of woman secured by severing the State from the Home, thereby introducing the voluntary principle into the Family and all its relationships. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Louise Michel. Price, 6 cents; two copies, 10 cents.

CO-OPERATION: ITS LAWS AND PRINciples. An essay showing Liberty and Equity as the only conditions of true co-operation, and exposing the violations of these conditions by Rent, Interest, Profit, and Majority Rule. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Herbert Spencer. Price, 6 cents; two copies, 10 cents.

THE RADICAL REVIEW: Vol. I. handsomely bound in cloth, and containing over sixty Essays, Poems, Translations, and Reviews, by the most prominent radical writers, on industrial, financial, social, literary, scientific, philosophical, ethical, and religious subjects. 828 pages octavo. Price, $5.00. Single numbers, $1.15.

LAND TENURE. An essay showing the governmental basis of land monopoly, the futility of governmental remedies, and a natural and peaceful way of starving out the landlords. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Robert Owen. Price, 6 cents; two copies, 10 cents.

THE REORGANIZATION OF BUSINESS. An essay showing how the principles of co-operation may be realized in the Store, the Bank, and the Factory. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Price, 6 cents; two copies, 10 cents.

THE IRON LAW OF WAGES. An Essay showing that wages could not be kept down to the cost of the laborer's subsistence were it not for the monopoly by a privileged class of the right to represent wealth by money. By Hugo Bilgram. Price, 5 cents.

AN ANARCHIST ON ANARCHY. An eloquent exposition of the beliefs of Anarchists by a man as eminent in science as in reform. By Elisee Reclus. Followed by a sketch of the criminal record of the author by E. Vaughan. Price, 10 cents.

CORPORATIONS. An essay showing how the monopoly of railroads, telegraphs, etc., may be abolished without the intervention of the State. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Wendell Phillips. Price, 6 cents; two copies, 10 cents.

SO THE RAILWAY KINGS ITCH FOR An Empire, Do They? By a "Red-Hot Striker," of Scranton, Pa. A reply to an article by William M. Grosvenor in the *International Review*. Price, 10 cents; per hundred, $4.00.

FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: Their Nature, Essence, and Maintenance. An abridgment and rearrangement of Lysander Spooner's "Trial by Jury." Edited by Victor Yarros. 47 pages. Price, 25 cents.

PROHIBITION. An essay on the relation of government to temperance, showing that prohibition cannot prohibit, and would be unnecessary if it could. By C. T. Fowler. Price, 6 cents; two copies, 10 cents.

THE FINANCIAL PROBLEM: Its relation to Labor Reform and Prosperity. Demonstrating the abolition of interest to be unavoidable. By Alfred B. Westrup. 30 pages. Price, 10 cents.

MUTUAL BANKING: Showing the Radical Deficiency of the existing Circulating Medium, and how Interest on Money can be Abolished. By William B. Greene. Price, 25 cents.

TAXATION OR FREE TRADE? A Criticism upon Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade." By John F. Kelly. 16 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 100 copies, $3.

CAPTAIN ROLAND'S PURSE: How It is Filled and How Emptied. By John Ruskin. The first of a projected series of Labor Tracts. Supplied at 37 cents per hundred.

A FEMALE NIHILIST. A thrilling sketch of the character and adventure of a typical Nihilistic heroine. By Stepniak, author of "Underground Russia." Price, 10 cents.

A POLITICIAN IN SIGHT OF HAVEN: Being a Protest Against the Government of Man by Man. By Auberon Herbert. Price, 10 cents.

THE STATE: ITS ORIGIN, ITS NATURE, And Its Abolition. By Albert Tarn, an English Anarchist. 19 pages. Price, 5 cents.

CITIZENS' MONEY: A critical analysis in the light of free trade in banking. By Alfred B. Westrup. 27 pages. Price, 10 cents.

SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC, MUtualistic, and Financial Fragments. By W. B. Greene. Price, $1.25.

TENDENCY NOVELS.

For any of the following Romances, address,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

MY UNCLE BENJAMIN. A humorous, satirical, and philosophical novel. By Claude Tillier. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. With a sketch of the author's life and works by Ludwig Pfau. This work, though it has enjoyed the honor of three translations into German, has never before been translated into English. It is one of the most delightfully witty works ever written. Almost every sentence excites a laugh. It is thoroughly realistic, but not at all repulsive. Its satirical treatment of humanity's foibles and its jovial but profound philosopy have won its author the title of "the modern Rabelais." My Uncle Benjamin riddles with the shafts of his good-natured ridicule the shams of theology, law, medicine, commerce, war, marriage, and society generally. 312 pages. Price, in cloth, $1.00; in paper, 50 cents.

THE RAG-PICKER OF PARIS. By Felix Pyat. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. A novel unequalled in its combination of dramatic power, picturesque intensity, crisp dialogue, panoramic effect, radical tendency, and bold handling of social questions. Probably the most vivid picture of the misery of poverty, the extravagance of wealth, the sympathy and forbearance of the poor and despised, the cruelty and aggressiveness of the aristocratic and respectable, the blind greed of the middle classes, the hollowness of charity, the cunning and hypocrisy of the priesthood, the tyranny and corruption of authority, the crushing power of privilege, and, finally, of the redeeming beauty of the ideal of liberty and equality that the century has produced. 325 pages. Price, in cloth, $1.00; in paper, 50 cents.

THE KREUTZER SONATA. By Count Leo Tolstoi. Translated by Benj. R. Tucker. This novel, dealing with the questions of love and marriage, urges a morality that is more than puritanical in its severity, while handling the delicate subject with all the frankness of the realistic school. This book, so far as the central lesson to be drawn from it is concerned, is of a reactionary character, and should not be regarded as a part of Liberty's propaganda. Yet it is a work of interest, almost a masterpiece of art, a romance not without sociological importance. No lover of independent thought can fail to admire its rare unconventionality, the fearless way in which the author addresses polite circles upon a subject which they generally taboo. Price, in cloth, $1.00; in paper, 50 cents.

THE STORY OF AN AFRICAN FARM. By Olive Schreiner. A romance, not of adventure, but of the intellectual life and growth of young English and German people living among the Boers and Kaffirs; picturing the mental struggles through which they passed in their evolution from orthodoxy to rationalism; and representing advanced ideas on religious and social questions. A work of remarkable power, beauty, and originality. 375 pages. Price, in cloth, 60 cents; in paper, 25 cents.

WHAT'S TO BE DONE? By, N. G. Tcherny, chewsky. Translated by Benj. R Tucker. With a portrait of the Author. Written in prison. Suppressed by the Czar. The author over twenty years an exile in Siberia. The book which has most powerfully influenced the youth of Russia in their growth into Nihilism. Whoever comes under its influence will fall in love with high ideals. 329 pages. Price, in cloth, $1.00; in paper, 35 cents.

THE ANARCHISTS:

A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century.

BY

JOHN HENRY MACKAY.

Translated from the German by

George Schumm.

A poet's prose contribution to the literature of philosophic and egoistic Anarchism. The author traces his own mental development in London amid the exciting events of 1887,—the manifestations of the unemployed, the rioting at Trafalgar Square, and the executions at Chicago. The antagonism between Communism and Anarchism sharply brought out. One of the world's great artists places his pen at the service of Anarchism.

CONTENTS.

Frontispiece portrait of the author. Introduction. I.—In the Heart of the World-Metropolis. II.—The Eleventh Hour. III.—The Unemployed. IV.—Carrard Auban. V.—The Champions of Liberty. VI.—The Empire of Hunger. VII.—The Tragedy of Chicago. VIII.—The Propaganda of Communism. IX.—Trafalgar Square. X.—Anarchy. Appendix.—Study of Mackay's Works, by Gabriele Reuter.

315 Pages.

Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

Address:

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

LIBERTY—Vols. V and VI.

Complete files of the fifth and sixth volumes of this journal, handsomely bound in cloth,

now for sale at

Two Dollars Each.

People who desire these volumes should apply for them early, as the number is limited. The first four volumes were long since exhausted, and it is easy to find persons eager for the privilege of paying ten dollars for a copy of the first volume. The others will soon be equally high.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.